

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/574,157	05/18/2000	Cary Lee Bates	ROC920000066	6988
7590 03/04/2004			EXAMINER	
Thomason Moser & Patterson LLP			HUYNH, BA	
Suite 1500				
3040 Post Oak Boulevard			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Houston, TX	77056-6582		2173 DATE MAILED: 03/04/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

→			
•	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Advisory Action	09/574,157	BATES ET AL.	/
•	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Ba Huynh	2173	÷
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address	•
THE REPLY FILED 24 February 2004 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this application and indication of the application	ation. A proper reply to a high places the application in	•
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailin b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE date on which the petition under 37 CF	g date of the final rejection. HE FINAL REJECTION. See MP R 1.136(a) and the appropriate ex	EP xtension
fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C	the shortened statutory period for reply ce later than three months after the main SFR 1.704(b).	originally set in the final Office ac ling date of the final rejection, eve	tion; or
 A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF 	R 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal o		÷
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:		
(a) they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (s	see NOTE below);	÷
(b) \square they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	elow);		:
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or simplifying	g the
(d) they present additional claims without canceli	ng a corresponding number of fi	inally rejected claims.	
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.			é
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	ion(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed amend	ment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: See		dered but does NOT place	the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY t	o issues which were newly	•
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we			
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			:
Claim(s) allowed: <u>none</u> .			•
Claim(s) objected to: <u>none</u> .			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>5-11, 21-29</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		1	
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) appr	roved or b) disapproved by the	he Examiner.	
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemer	•	1	
 10.☐ Other:	//	BAHUYNH MARY EXAMINER	· ·
		TO THE PARTITION OF THE	





Continuation of 2. NOTE: Further adding limitations to the independent claims5, 11, and 21 does not reduce or simplify the issue for appeal.

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The applicants argue that the claimed inventions are different to the combination of Gerace&Stern (page 7, 4th par.) however failed to particularly point out any limitation that is not met by the cited references. In response to the argument that Gerace as modified by Stern is inoperable, there is insuficient evidences to convince that the applicants alligation is true. Storing a user profile at the client side is well known in the art.